	Case 2:23-cr-00205-KJM	Document 38	Filed 01/21/25	Page 1 of 2	
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
10					
11	United States of America,		No. 2:23-CR-0	0205-KJM	
12	Plair	tiff,	ORDER		
13	v.				
14	Richard Arellano-Mendoza,				
15	Defendant.				
16					
17	Defendant Richard Arellano-Mendoza brings two motions. One, he seeks to dismiss				
18	count four of his indictment, which charges him with violating 18 U.S.C. § 111(b) because he				
19	argues § 111(b) violates his due process rights under the Fifth Amendment. See generally ECF				
20	No. 32. Two, he also moves to strike count four of the indictment as a predicate offense for count				
21	six because he claims § 111(b) is not categorically a crime of violence and cannot serve as a				
22	predicate crime for the count six charge based on 18 U.S.C. § 924(c). See generally ECF No. 33.				
23	The government opposes both motions. See ECF Nos. 35–36. On January 14, 2025, the court				
24	heard oral argument on both motions. Emily Sauvageau appeared for the government. Megan				
25	Hopkins and Christina Sinha appeared for Arellano-Mendoza. See Mins. Mot. Hr'g (Jan. 14,				
26	2025), ECF No. 37.				
27	The court denies Arellano-Mendoza's motion to dismiss as it is foreclosed by precedent.				
28	See United States v. Feola, 420	0 U.S. 6/1 (1975);	United States v. Mo	obley, 803 F.3d 1105 (9th Cir.	

	Case 2:23-cr-00205-KJM Document 38 Filed 01/21/25 Page 2 of 2				
1	2015). And, as signaled at hearing, agreeing with another judge of this court, the court also				
2	denies Arellano-Mendoza's motion to strike. See United States v. Broadbent, No: 2:19-CR-				
3	00155 DJC, 2023 WL 6963438 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 20, 2023). The court recognizes Arellano-				
4	Mendoza's clarification, in one respect, that he is in fact making an overbreadth and not a				
5	vagueness challenge, but the court would still arrive at the same conclusion given that Arellano-				
6	Mendoza's argument is foreclosed by the precedent of this Circuit. See United States v. Juvenile				
7	Female, 566 F.3d 943 (9th Cir. 2009). The court thus declines the invitation to "make history" as				
8	Arellano-Mendoza's counsel urges.				
9	This order resolves ECF Nos. 32, 33.				
10	IT IS SO ORDERED.				
11	DATED: January 17, 2025.				

SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE